DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 470 CE 026 769

TITLE	Adult Education State Plan Development: Apprcaches to Participatory Planning in Selected States.
INSTITUTION	Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Evaluation and Dissemination.
PUB DATE	10 Jan 80
CONTRACT	300-78-0469
NOTE	30p.; For related documents see CE 026 767-768.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Education: Adults: Agency Cooperation: Cooperation: *Cooperative Planning: Coordination: Educational Legislation: Federal Legislation: *Long Range Planning: *Master Plans: Participation: Program Descriptions: Regional Cooperation: *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Adult Education Amendments 1978: Adult Education State Plans: California: Delaware: Kansas: Louisiana: Mississippi: New Jersey: New Mexico

ABSTRACT

This report describes the major approaches to participatory planning used by seven states in responding to the requirement for a three-year Adult Education State Plan of the 1978 Amendments to the Adult Education Act. (Information was collected during two visits per state to California, Delaware, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, and New Mexico to document and assess their planning processes.) The first chapter is an introduction. Chapter 2 describes the four major approaches or models adopted by the states in developing their three-year state plans, ranging from a high degree of local involvement in establishing program needs through a regional level approach to exclusively state level development. The various approaches are (1) state adult education staff with minimal input (California, Delaware, New Mexico), (2) statewide participatory planning groups (Mississippi, Louisiana), (3) regional planning groups (Kansas), and (4) local (county) participatory planning groups (New Jersey). A summary and conclusions are presented in Chapter 3. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193470

ADULT EDUCATION STATE PLAN DEVELOPMENT: APPROACHES TO PARTICIPATORY PLANNING IN SELECTED STATES

Submitted to:

Office of Education and Dissemination/USOE
Under Contract No. HEW 300-78-0469

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted by:

Development Associates, Inc.
2924 Columbia Pike
Arlington, Virginia 22204

January 10, 1980

CE 026 769

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	1
II.	APPROACHES TO PLANNING ADOPTED BY THE STATES	3
	Model 1: California, Delaware and New Mexico	3
	Model 2: Mississippi and Louisiana.	7
	Model 3: Kansas	15
	Model 4: New Jersey	18
III.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	26

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The 1978 amendments to the Adult Education Act were substantial. The definition of persons eligible for program services was expanded and state planning requirements were modified greatly. As initially conceived by USOE, implementation of the new AE legislation for discretionary funds was to include the award of one-year planning grants to each state department of education. These discretionary grants were to assist states in facilitating a participatory planning process through which they would identify their individual special population needs, develop strategies for meeting those needs and prepare a three-year AE state plan.

In the AE appropriation, as finally approved, these one-year planning grants were not included. As well, the preparation, development and submittal time period for each state's initial three-year plan was effectively reduced to nine months. As a result, the states had to compress an extended participatory planning process into four to five months.

During this abbreviated planning period DA visited seven states to document and assess their planning processes. The states were: California, Delaware, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey and New Mexico. Two visits were made to each state, once early in the plan development process and once in the final phase. During the visits, AE staff and representatives of public and private organizations concerned with adult education were interviewed and several participatory planning meetings observed.

A purpose of the visits was to describe the strategies and techniques which were used by the states. This was in the expectation that it would

assist USOE and the states in implementing the new legislation and in preparing future three-year plans. This will be the focus of this report.

In this report a description of the major approaches to participatory planning used by the seven states is presented. Clearly, these do not constitute the only participatory planning strategies available, nor were they the only ones used across the 57 states and territories. Rather, their purpose is to serve as examples of how some states responded to the requirements for participatory planning. Hopefully, this report will serve as a stimulus which promotes discussion among adult educators concerned with participatory planning and also will be useful in preparing for the next three-year planning cycle.

II. APPROACHES TO PLANNING ADOPTED BY THE STATES

Four major approaches or "models" were adopted by the states in developing their three-year state plans. In terms of participation, the four models range from a high degree of local involvement in establishing program needs, through a regional level approach, to exclusively state level development. The chart below indicates the various approaches adopted by the states to gain participation in the planning process.

SUMMARY OF APPROACHES TO PARTICIPATORY PLANNING IN STATE PLAN DEVELOPMENT
(Spring 1979)

States	State AE Staff with Minimal Input	Statewide Participatory Planning Groups	Regional Planning Groups	Local Participatory Planning Groups
California	X			
Delaware	X			
Kansas			X	
Louisiana		X		
Mississippi		X		
New Jersey				X
New Mexico	X			

Model 1: California, Delaware and New Mexico

These states made the least amount of change in their approach to planning from previous years, with state plan development accomplished almost entirely by SEA personnel. All three directors stated that the expenses involved in creating and supporting a

participatory planning process were prohibitive given current timing and appropriations. They also stated that there was not sufficient time available to design and implement an extensive participatory planning process. The directors were also very conscious of their responsibility for the development of the state plan, and, to varying degrees, expressed concern about the wisdom of involving agencies and individuals outside the SEA prior to having a clearly defined set of guidelines and expectations.

In two states, (California and New Mexico) the method used to elicit input from other organizations and agencies into the planning process was via one-on-one consultation. By telephone and in person, the adult education staff solicited the views of interested agencies about the content of the plan. The agencies involved included: Vocational Education, the Department of Corrections, Department of Aging, CETA, Right to Read, Employment Development Department, Job Corps, Office of Economic Opportunity, and others.

Most of the agency representatives DA interviewed in these states indicated they had not made a meaningful input into the plan. However, the representatives from the departments of corrections and of aging, and from the vocational education program indicated they had had sufficient input to ensure that their clients' interests were addressed in the state plan. In all cases, the input from these outside agencies and organizations was largely confined to determining how they fitted into the plan and what their role might be in meeting the plan's goals and objectives.

California and New Mexico had previously worked with state level AE advisory councils. In California, the state advisory council had been disbanded prior to the initiation of the state plan development process. In New Mexico, the State Advisory Board formally meets once annually. Although the New Mexico Board did not have final approval of the State Plan, the members did review the plan prior to its submittal to the State Superintendent and State Board of Education, and their concerns were considered before final approval.

The third state (Delaware) had not previously worked with an advisory council in the development of state AE plans but did have a tradition of interagency coordination on an informal basis. Also, its state level staff consisted of only one person, who also had several other major responsibilities. In that state, the strategy for developing the three year plan was for it to be drafted by the AE director and then submitted to a newly formed participartory planning committee for comments. The committee was composed of representatives of the types of organizations identified in the federal legislation. The AE director, in consultation with the director's immediate supervisor and local project coordinators, selected those who would participate. The criteria used to select participants was their familiarity with the AE program and that they would be supportive of the effort.

In accord with this approach and due to state timelines for review, the AE director wrote the "draft" proposal for review and comment by the participatory planning committee. Comments were incorporated in the "final" version of the plan which was then submitted to the state's regular review process. The participatory planning

committee was forwarded the "draft plan" in advance of its first and only meeting which was held about a week after completion of the draft plan and less than a week before the state's deadline for submitting the final version to the Governor's review process. In essence, then, the new plan was drafted and rewritten by the AE Director, after receiving minor comments from the participatory planning committee constituted to meet specific requirements of "participatory planning" mandated by the new legislation.

In the first two states, (California and New Mexico) the establishment of AE needs and the setting of goals and priorities is a responsibility of both the state and local levels. The state plans reflect an assessment of state-wide need as determined by the SEA. Then, in their application for funds, the local programs are required to show evidence of input from labor, voluntary organizations, and other groups identified in the legislation. Each applicant agency is also to determine what kind of participatory process it wishes to implement.

In the third state, (Delaware) changes have been mandated in the local programs' planning process. The state will now require all local applicants to show evidence that they have planned in cooperation with a wide range of local agencies, programs, and organizations. Each local grantee will also be required to establish a local "participatroy planning" committee. Another requirement of local grantees will be that they negotiate cooperative agreements with local agencies and organizations such as the Division of Social Services or municipal government which can provide supportive services such as child care and transportation.

In summary, at the state level one or two individuals were responsible for assembling current SEA data plus that received from other state and private agencies and for developing the three-year state plan. Since special processes were not yet initiated in these states, additional expenditures of funds were not incurred. Several respondents indicated, however, that they believed amounts ranging upward from $50,000 would be requisite for a planning grant if a more inclusive statewide participatory planning process was to be tried.

Model 2: Mississippi and Louisiana

Two states established statewide participatory planning committees (PPC's) specifically to assist in developing the three-year state plan. The manner in which the committees were constituted varied according to each state's laws and administrative style. Both of these states had relatively active state Advisory Councils prior to the new legislation, and perhaps due to this past experience and familiarity with state level councils, the PPC strategies were developed.

The participatory planning committee (PPC) in one state (Mississippi) was organized by a state level steering committee. The AE Director selected four members of the state Adult Education Association to form the Steering Committee. They included the past president and president-elect of the Association. One other member was Chairman of the Association's Legislative Committee, and another was a member of the Board of Directors. In sum, all were key leaders in Adult Education. The State AE Director reported using three criteria in selecting the Steering Committee -- that they would provide continuity, permanency, and legitimacy.

The Steering Committee met in November for the first time to receive an orientation from the AE Director. He gave reading materials, a thorough orientation, and presented the need to establish the PPC. The Steering Committee agreed to meet again and nominate council members. In late December, the Steering Committee met and nominated 38 participants. This list was reviewed and approved by the State Superintendent of Education whereupon the AE Director called the Steering Committee and they in turn called their specific nominees to confirm their participation. The PPC had representatives from all areas required by the federal legislation, plus five student-participants representing urban and rural areas. Once the list was completed, the State Superintendent of Education sent a letter inviting each one to participate on the Planning Council.

The PPC met twice in the state capitol for one-day meetings. In each case, approximately 20 representatives attended the meetings. The first meeting focused primarily on providing information and an orientation to the participants regarding their tasks, roles, and responsibilities. The agenda included introductions of the members, a history and the current status of AE in the state, an overview of the 1978 amendments to the AE Act, and a discussion of the Planning Council's role. Each participant received a notebook including the following items: The New AE Amendments, a PPC membership list, FY 78 budget allocations to each grantee, and general census data for the state.

The second meeting, held three weeks later, focused on an assessment of the needs for AE across the state. Through small group process, a set of 13 needs was identified. Due to time limitations, it was agreed to mail out a list of the 13 needs for individual prioritization. Once these were sent back, the state AE staff began to draft the three-year plan.

After the comments were received, the AE Supervisor and his staff wrote the first draft of the three-year plan. The "draft plan" was to be submitted for review to the "Steering Committee." After revisions, a copy of the draft was reviewed by the Division of Adult Education in USOE and then prepared for the normal state approval procedure.

Several factors were critical in the operation of the participatory planning process in this state. The Steering Committee played a crucial role in both selecting participants and helping to facilitate their participation. In some cases, they provided transportation to and from the meetings. The state did not provide either per diem or transportation costs to the planning meetings. However, a local AE program did provide a free lunch to all participants during both meetings. Each one-day meeting was attended by approximately 20 participants. However, those attending the second meeting were not the same 20 who attended the first meeting. While not certain, some attributed the low attendance (20 out of 38 invited) at each meeting to the lack of per diem or reimbursement for transportation costs. Since the meeting was held in the state capitol, some participants would have had to drive over 200 miles during the same day.

Overall, the focus of participatory planning efforts in the state was on the staff of local programs. Some, but relatively little, effort was made to involve staff of other state agencies or departments. Interviews with personnel in other agencies indicated that they were aware of the new planning requirements to a limited extent since the AE Director had informed each of them informally either by telephone or in person. None of the state agencies contacted had representatives on any state-level AE committee; however, the State AE staff did participate on several of their committees. Right to Read's Literacy Task Force and the Council on Aging's Advisory Council, for example, both include a representative from Adult Education.

While these state level representatives of the major related agencies and programs were not directly involved in the development of the new three-year state plan, all were quick to point out that at the local level there is cooperation in program implementation between the various adult-related programs. During a meeting with local AE program directors, the state AE Director indicated that at least seven agencies should be involved in the local AE planning process, and the local program directors must show they have made every effort to accomplish this involvement. These agencies are the Local School System, Community College, Agricultural Extension Service, the Local Library System, the Health and Welfare Department, the Council on Aging, and the Employment Security Commission. Even though programs were previously required to establish a local advisory council, no specific agencies were named for membership. This is a new requirement for most local programs.

In the other state (Louisiana) using the PPC strategy, the organization of the participatory planning committee was quite different. In this state, the State Superintendent and the State Board of Education require the formation of any advisory body to be submitted to them for approval. Thus, the State AE Director submitted to them a plan for forming a PPC along with a request for appointees to serve on the committee.

The State Superintendent appointed six representatives; these were from labor, business and industry, public and private schools, the anti-poverty program, and the SEA. The State Board appointed eight persons; they represented the state's Adult Education Advisory Council, State Vocational Technical Schools, adults from rural areas, adults from urban areas with high unemployment, adults with limited English language skills, and institutionalized adults. The state's Association of Public, Continuing, and Adult Education appointed six participants; they represented AE students, teachers, paraprofessionals, supervisors, and the professional adult educators. An additional 20 appointees, designated by the AE State Director, came from the private and public sectors; they included a representative from the State Literacy Council, an hispanic organization, the Inter-Tribal Council, the Governor's Manpower Council, and the Bureau of Aging. In total, 40 persons were appointed to participate on the participatory planning committee.

The responsibilities of the PPC were defined by the AE staff as follows:

- Review and comment on all phases of Plan development;
- Advise and assist the state AE staff regarding the format and composition of the Plan;
- Provide the state director information and supportive materials from each of the various areas of concern for inclusion in the needs assessment and inventory of resources of the Plan; and
- Provide a communication and dissemination network for Plan development and implementation.

The AE staff wrote the three-year plan in two sections. The first section defined the general provisions of the legislation, established the general need for AE in the state, and reviewed the state resources available for adult education. The second section of the Plan specified the major goals of the Plan, method of allocation, application procedures, proposal evaluation criteria and local program requirements.

The first section was mailed to all members of the PPC prior to its first meeting, held in late January. During the meeting, several changes were made by the PPC in the first section of the "draft plan." Perhaps the most significant change was the decision to require all teachers of adult education to acquire a specific number of credit hours (i.e., six) in specified adult education courses. Heretofore, teachers in AE classes were simply required to hold a state teaching certificate in either elementary or secondary education. The new requirement is being encouraged by the State Superintendent as well as the AE division.

Once the changes were incorporated into the first half of the plan, the second section was completed and preparations were made to mail a copy of the "draft" to all participatory planning committee members. During this period, the state staff met for a day with the DAE representative responsible for providing assistance in state plan development. The meeting was in the HEW regional office in a neighboring state and was judged helpful by the state AE staff. The DAE specialist reviewed the initial draft and consulted with the state AE staff regarding the "language and style of the document." This, along with the planning committee comments, led to the development of a second draft which included a set of five major goals, each followed by a series of specific activities. This second draft was mailed to all committee members.

The PPC met again in late March to review and approve the three-year AE State Plan. A total of 16 participants, plus four staff, critiqued the plan page by page. The state AE Director walked the participants through the plan and asked for comments.

After the second meeting, the staff incorporated several suggestions into the plan and prepared to submit it through the normal state approval process. This includes the state Adult Education Advisory Council (board appointed) which had an opportunity for review and comment prior to approval by the State Board of Education. A final copy of the plan was also mailed to each participatory planning committee member.

Overall, several points should be noted about the process followed in this state. To facilitate attendance at the PPC meetings, the state AE division in their letter of invitation stated they would provide reimbursement for travel for those who requested it. However, only sixteen of the forty invited PPC members attended the second meeting and of these only seven had also attended the first. With respect to the meetings themselves, it is noteworthy that no specific tools were provided before or during the meetings with which to evaluate goals, activities or the plan; and it was evident that very few participants had read the plan prior to the meeting. In addition, during the meeting no visual aids were used to help explain the plan or its goals or contents. However, the entire meeting was carefully recorded, with a secretary keeping extensive notes so as to be able to incorporate changes in the plan as a result.

Finally, it is of note that among the outcomes of the state planning process will be some substantial changes in the planning procedures at the local level. Specifically, for example, local programs are now required to submit program proposals which "include specific objectives based on identified needs" and which describe how they will expand services through interagency cooperation and coordination. This will be a new procedure for all LEA's in the state. Previously, they simply submitted a budget and personnel description form without a narrative.

In summary, then, the planning process in these states was altered as a result of the 1978 amendments. Although participation in the State Plan development process was not widespread, it was more extensive than in previous years and appeared to have had an effect on the contents of the three-year state plans. In both states special staff time was devoted to coordinating the PPCs, but there were virtually no other AE program expenditures involved.

Model 3: Kansas

This state utilized a regional approach to participatory planning. Basically, this involved the conduct of five regional meetings organized by the state's AE specialist with the assistance of three area coordinators. It is noteworthy that the area coordinators are on the staff of local programs, but regularly serve as contacts between the SEA and other programs at the local level. The state AE staff consists of only one full-time AE specialist, plus a doctoral intern.

The purpose of the regional meetings was to assist in:

(a) assessing needs;

(b) identifying resources; and

(c) setting goals and objectives.

All local directors of adult education programs were asked to participate and to invite representatives of the various public and private organizations identified in the federal legislation.

The five regional meetings were held during the months of October and November 1978. These one-day meetings were held to gain input from various unions, community, civic and volunteer organizations, religious organizations, and representatives of urban and rural areas. In total fifty-eight representatives participated from agencies such as: Right to Read, Department of Human Resources, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Aging, and state manpower agencies. In each case, a series of statements regarding needs, goals, objectives and areas needing improvement were listed. In several cases, the area planning group prioritized their suggestions.

As soon as the meetings were completed the AE specialist, with the assistance of a doctoral intern, analyzed the public meeting reports and wrote the first draft of the three-year plan. From that point, the remainder of the planning process was essentially the same as in prior years. As part of that process, copies of the "draft plan" were sent out to all universities, two-year colleges, and vocational-technical colleges in the state as well as members of the state AE Advisory Council for review and comment. Then, in early January 1979, the Assistant Commissioner of Education or his representative made a brief presentation, including a two-page summary of the AE plan, for the State Board of Education. The Board's comments were included in the revisions of the plan which was finalized for the Board by the following month. After the Board received a copy of the plan, a public hearing date was set. A public notice was placed in the SEA's "Journal" which was mailed to a select list, including all universities, two-year colleges, and vocational-technical colleges.

At the same time the Board received the plan, five copies of the plan were sent to the Governor's office for approval. Another copy went to the State's legal services agency for review and approval.

An important early decision effecting the planning process related to the role of the state AE Advisory Council. The state has a relatively active council which had been directly involved in previous years' planning processes. The Advisory Council is composed of representatives of the elderly, minority groups, educationally disadvantaged, adult education students, higher education institutions, area vocational-technical schools, adult educators, the Department of Corrections, the Adult Education Association, librarians, business and industry and a representative of special education. Although the Council did review the State Plan, it was not given a prominent role in the planning process. The Division of Adult Education (DAE) in the U.S. Office of Education indicated that participation of existing advisory councils generally would not be sufficient to meet the participatory planning requirements of the new legislation.

As was normally the case, the review of the draft plan by the State AE Advisory Council and the various other agencies to which the Plan was sent produced few comments at the public hearing or even through informal channels. Essentially, final revisions to the draft were the result of a review by DAE's state planning specialist and the further reflections of SEA personnel.

In sum, the process in this state of developing the new three-year AE plan did encompass a somewhat larger and more diverse group of people than in the past. Traditionally, there had been at least some opportunity for input from an advisory council and potential program sponsors from across the state. With the addition of the five regional meetings to the existing procedures, the number of people who were given an opportunity for input increased. Also, and perhaps more important, the point of access now preceeded the preparation of the initial drafting of the plan. As with the other states, the change in the process was accomplished at very little cost. All that was involved was the time required to arrange and staff the five meetings and the travel costs of the SEA personnel.

Model 4: New Jersey

After considering several alternative planning strategies, this state decided that county level planning was more suitable than either a statewide or regional approach. Each county has unique characteristics which need to be considered, and most counties already had an advisory council for adult, continuing, and community education. The AE participatory planning process could build upon and possibly strengthen these county advisory councils.

Once the county level approach was chosen, state AE staff developed a participatory planning model. The model was then reviewed with the adult education resource centers in the state and revised somewhat as a result. In essence, two meetings were to be held in each county. These were to be attended by a wide range of agencies and groups,

and the result was to be a summary for each county of AE needs, goals, resources and planned activities for the next three years.

To start the process, the state AE staff contacted the office of each county superintendent of education and described the procedures to be followed. A planning facilitator for each county was then selected through the local advisory council or superintendent, except in a few cases where neither was available and a local AE project director was asked to fill this role.

A training session for facilitators was held in the state capital in early December 1978 to review the changes in the AE legislation and the procedures to follow in implementing the participatory planning model. One facilitator came from each county. A helper from the State Bureau of Adult, Continuing, and Community Education or from one of the state educational resource centers was assigned to assist each county facilitator in this activity.

To aid each county facilitator in planning and implementing the local planning process, a package of materials was developed and distributed. The package contained:

- Planning Meeting Guidelines;
- Handouts on the AE Act, Target Populations and Authorized Services;
- Four Data Collection/Recording Instruments;

1. Education Needs (Form 1)
2. Program Goals and Need Summary (Form 2)
3. Program Goals, Objectives and Resources (Form 3)
4. Resource Identification/Cooperative Implementation (Form 4)

- A master matrix of target groups and services;
- Suggested planning committee composition (categories and possible contacts within each);
- Address lists for local CETA Directors, Title XX Coordinators, County Career Education Coordinators, and United Way Coordinators; and
- Sample Invitational and Follow-up Letters.

Each county was to hold two meetings. The facilitator was to identify as many participants from the lists provided as possible, and a letter of invitation was to be sent to each of the county superintendents. This was to be followed by a phone call and then by another letter with a package of background materials to those who indicated they would attend the first meetings.

The background materials included handouts about the Act plus data on the educational attainment level of adults in the county and current ABE and secondary completion programming. The major objective of the first meeting was to identify educational needs of adults in the county. The needs were to be recorded on the Educational Needs Form by small groups and then summarized on the master matrix of target groups and authorized services.

DA observed two initial county meetings. The results of those two meetings were quite different and were the direct result of each facilitator's ability to organize and direct the meeting and the extent to which they followed (or did not follow) the recommended process provided by the state. In one meeting, the facilitator had not sent out the initial letters of invitation, made follow-up phone calls, nor sent out a second letter containing the package of background materials. He had also not availed himself of the assistance offered by the State. Perhaps as a result, including the facilitator, only thirteen individuals attended the initial meeting, and of these half were local Adult Education program directors. In addition, the meeting's purpose was obscur and the meeting became focused entirely on the issue of transportation, with little, if any, discussion of the identification of the educational needs of the adult target population. Ultimately, the meeting was adjourned with the understanding that the facilitator was to:

(a) summarize the very minimal discussion of needs, and

(b) make a concerted effort to secure wider participation for the second planning meeting.

The other initial county meeting DA attended was highly successful. The facilitator had implemented the recommended state guidelines for organizing the meeting and more than fifty people were in attendance. These included representatives from all target populations and geographic sections of the county plus such organizations as LEA's, community colleges, community service centers, CETA, WIN, social service agencies, hospitals, the Urban League and Aspira.

The major objective of identifying the educational needs of the county adults was met, and the meeting had sufficient focus and guidance to serve as an effective mechanism for interagency communications.

Prior to the second meeting, the county facilitators summarized the needs identified during the initial planning committee meeting and drafted goals for their counties on a form provided by the state. This information was then sent out to all participants for review prior to the second meeting. The objectives of the second meeting were:

- to discuss possible areas for cooperation and planning;
- to rank order program goals;
- to develop goal indicators; i.e., identify specific program objectives and activities for the next three years against which goal attainment will be measured; and
- to identify the resources needed to carry out the specific objectives and activities.

After receiving the materials from all 21 counties, state AE staff compiled the state three-year plan. The plan includes prioritized goals, prioritized objectives for three years, and indicators of resources for each objective on a county by county basis. In the state plan each county's prioritized needs and goals are included to reflect the variation in areas.

In order to complete the process of involving agency representatives in the development of the plan, copies of the draft state plan were placed for examination in each area library in the state library system. In addition, agency representatives were notified and invited to submit written comments through the mail or to testify at a public hearing held in the state capital in early May.

Following the public hearing and final revisions, the state plan underwent the manditory reviews by the Offices of the State Commissioner of Education, the Attorney General, and the Governor. Also, a final draft of the plan was discussed with staff of DAE to assure compliance with federal requirements.

Of some note was the limited role of the state Advisory Council for Adult, Continuing, and Community Education throughout the planning process. The State Council was fully involved in designing the process for developing the State Plan and in the decision that county level advisory councils, rather than the state council, would play the primary role. In accordance with this design, the State Council is expected to play a significant role in implementation of the plan.

By formal resolution, the State Advisory Council has accepted joint responsibility with the state's Bureau of AE for the formation of a planning task force and for expediting all activities related to accomplishing its objectives over the three year period of the AE plan. As stated in the draft plan, those objectives are:

- "To compile and produce a report of educational, training and support services available through state agencies and programs;

- To develop specific goals related to the needs of the least educated adults for inclusion in future state plans of the respective agencies and programs; and
- To develop further avenues for cooperative planning and programming and for sharing resources."

The task force will include those members of the Council who represent state agencies or programs, as well as representatives of other state agencies which are not presently represented on the Council. Currently, the Council includes representatives of the Department of Labor and Industry, State Manpower Services Council, Bureau of Comprehensive Employment and Training, Department of Health and Department of Community Affairs.

In summary, the thrust of this approach to participatory planning was at the local level, with little direct effort made to bring about involvement at the state level in the planning process. However, the state's Bureau of AE was very active in stimulating the broadened local involvement. State staff set up the guidelines for initiating inter-agency cooperation and were available to provide assistance to the county facilitators in initiating and carrying out the participatory planning process. In fact, a state AE representative was present at all the initial and follow-up county planning committee meetings.

With respect to costs, careful records were not kept during the planning process. However, the state AE Director gave the following rough estimates:

42 days for state professional staff at $125 average	=	$5,250
Travel to meetings	=	336
Luncheon for training sessions of facilitators	=	200
		$5,786

Conservatively estimating that the time and travel incurred by the local facilitator; and participants in the two county meetings was roughly the equivalent of the state personnel, the total estimated expenditure for the planning process would be approximately $11,000.

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Of the seven states studied, there was little change in the processes used in previous years in three states while in four there was some substantive change resulting from the amendments of 1978. In the three with little change, the letter of the law was met largely through delegation of responsibilities to the local level. The general feeling in these states was that the prior processes were generally consistent with the new legislation and ought not be changed. They argued that major increases in participation would require significant increases in time and direct expenditures which were not possible during this first planning period -- and may always be of questionable worth.

At least some substantive increase in public involvement in the planning process did occur at little or no cost in four states, however. Two of these states developed statewide participatory planning committees while the third implemented a series of regional planning meetings to secure input for the state plan. The fourth implemented a participatory planning process at the county level across the state which resulted in county-level three-year AE plans. While limited time and other factors contributed to imperfections in implementing a truly participatory process in each of these states, some change in procedure and an increase in agency and target group involvement did occur. Indeed, there appears to have been a substantial increase in the breadth and depth of public involvement in the state using

the county-level approach. And even in that state the cost of implementation was quite small.

Overall, the existing state AE advisory councils played a very limited role in the planning process. Also, it is clear that generally the responsibility for broad-scale involvement of agencies and target groups tended to be shifted down from the state to local levels. Relatively little effort was expended to secure broad agency or target group involvement at the state-wide level.

In sum, the level and quality of the efforts devoted to participatory planning in the preparation of the first three-year plans were rather low. While this was understandable and to some extent appropriate, given the limited time available, there needs to be a substantial increase in both as the second round of plans are prepared. To varying degrees, the experience in the states studied clearly suggests it is feasible to comply with the spirit of the 1978 legislation. For this to be truly nation-wide, however, some, but not a great deal of, additional funds may be needed. Rather, time and creativity on the part of state AE staff appear to be the two single most important ingredients, and DAE should endeavor to provide the states assistance in designing and implementing workable processes over the coming two years.